

ERRATA

FORT MASON CENTER LONG-TERM LEASE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

The following editorial corrections are made on both pages 27 and 63 of the environmental assessment (EA):

1. The word “streetcar” replaces “trolley” in all instances.
2. The sentence that begins with “The E/F-Line currently extends from the Castro...” is changed to begin with “The F-Line currently extends from the Castro...”
3. Following the above sentence, a new sentence is added as follows: “ Muni is planning to initiate an E-Line Historic Streetcar Service in the near future that will extend from Jones Street in Fisherman’s Wharf via Jefferson and Beach Streets, and then along The Embarcadero and King Street past PacBell Park to the Caltrain Station.”
4. The sentence that begins with “For many years it has been proposed that this line be extended to Fort Mason...” is changed to begin with “For many years it has been proposed that the E/F-Line be extended to Fort Mason...”

The above changes to the document reflect comments made by San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI).

Public Outreach and Review of the EA

The NPS and FMF sought input from the public, other agencies, and environmental organizations throughout the environmental review process. On March 1, 2003, the NPS sent a scoping notice announcing its intention to prepare an EA for the Fort Mason Center Long-Term Lease and to hold a public scoping meeting to determine the scope of impact topics and alternatives to be addressed in the EA (see Appendix A of the EA). The public meeting, held on March 18, 2003, introduced the proposal and invited comments on a number of topics proposed for possible change and study in the planning and environmental review process. Interested parties were encouraged to provide comment on the project through April 16, 2003. Two members of the public spoke at the scoping meeting (Alma Robinson of California Lawyers for the Arts and Michael Alexander), and two written comments, both from resident organizations of the FMF, were received. Without specifically mentioning the lease, one letter from the SFMOMA Artists Gallery opposed implementation of paid parking at the FMC for both visitors and staff, and a second letter from the Performing Arts Workshop fully supported the Fort Mason Center Long-Term Lease.

The EA was circulated for public review on August 8, 2003 and the public review period for the EA closed on September 22, 2003. Notice of the EA availability was posted on the National Park Service (NPS) website at <http://www.nps.gov/goga/admin/planning/foma-ea.htm>. In addition, about 1,300 mailers were distributed to public agencies, interest groups, organizations, and individuals associated with

the GGNRA, to announce a public meeting to receive public comments. The public meeting for the project was held on September 9, 2003 at the Fort Mason Center. In addition to the oral testimony at the public meeting, five comment letters on the project were received during the public review period. Comments received on the EA and responses to these comments are provided below.

In addition to the above efforts to solicit public input, the National Park Service and the Fort Mason Foundation met with the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) on August 28, 2003. The intent of the meeting was to present the purpose and need for the proposed long-term lease, to describe how the EA addresses BCDC's Bay Plan, and to discuss BCDC's interests. BCDC's preliminary comments offered at the meeting were incorporated in a comment letter on the EA (described below).

Responses to Public Comments on the EA

1. Andrea Gaut, Coastal Program Analyst, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). Ms. Gaut offered some initial thoughts about the project during an August 28, 2003 meeting with the National Park Service (NPS) and Fort Mason Foundation (FMF), and restated BCDC's points in a comment letter dated September 26, 2003. The letter makes two major points, summarized below.

- The BCDC believes that the NPS should submit a consistency determination for the proposed lease and future work that the lease will require NPS to complete. BCDC is particularly concerned about (1) placing fill in the San Francisco Bay (Bay) that could result from modifications to Pier One, and (2) limitations on public access to the Bay or shoreline that could result from the possible implementation of a paid parking program and from installation of a fence around the pier aprons. BCDC commented that the gates should be closed at sunset and opened at sunrise, that public access should be assured through the gates during designated hours, and that the design of the fence and gates should be attractive and inviting to the public. The BCDC stated in its comments that the consistency determination should provide consistency analyses with the McAteer-Petris Act and the San Francisco Bay Plan, even though BCDC stated in its scoping letter to the NPS dated June 9, 2003 that the Coastal Zone Management Act "exempts from the coastal zone federal enclaves and federal lands subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal government."
- The BCDC believes that the FMF would need to obtain a BCDC permit for rehabilitation of Pier One and any other work on pier structures and the seawall.

Response: Regarding the first major point, the EA on pages 72 through 79 describes the McAteer-Petris Act of 1965 and BCDC's *San Francisco Bay Plan*, key provisions concerning bay fill and public access, and how the proposed lease would be supportive of and consistent with these plans and policies. A more detailed response to BCDC has been prepared by NPS in a letter dated October 23,

2003. The letter provides evidence of the proposed action's consistency with these plans and policies and requests BCDC's to make a consistency determination.

Regarding BCDC's expressed concern that a paid parking program could restrict public access to the shoreline, plans for imposition of parking fees at FMC have not been finalized. The EA (page 69) and the Transportation Demand Management Plan (Appendix D of the EA) explain that there are many options for structuring a paid parking program and that there are options to accommodate short-term visitors and employees without substantially affecting parking supply in the neighboring Marina district. The FMF has stated that plans for imposition of parking fees would not be finalized without further discussions with FMC residents.

Regarding BCDC's comments about the proposed gates on the pier aprons, page 26 of the EA states that gates would be installed along the aprons of the piers for improved safety and security. These gates would be locked during nighttime hours as unauthorized activities, such as fires, occur late at night along the pier sheds. Because locking the security fence would be restricted to late-night hours, it is not expected that this would interfere with public access to the waterfront; the vast majority of visits occur during the daylight hours. Ensuring that the gates would be open during designated hours would be the responsibility of the FMF. Design of the gates will not occur until funding is available and plan drawings have been prepared.

BCDC's second major comment states that FMF should obtain BCDC permits for improvements it proposes. The NPS concurs that BCDC should be consulted on future improvements. However, the project is being proposed by the NPS, a federal agency, within federal lands. Therefore, a consistency determination for future work that the lease will require would not appear to be necessary. Work undertaken at FMC is undertaken under the authority of the NPS and with oversight by NPS. Consequently, future projects should be reviewed using the federal consistency determinations, rather than the permitting process required of non-federal project sponsors. Although FMF is a partner with the NPS and intends to make many of the improvements needed to restore and upgrade FMC, modifications must be performed with approval from the NPS.

There is an unusually high level of NPS scrutiny and oversight over FMF maintenance activities and structural modifications at Fort Mason, because the NPS is charged with maintaining the site's integrity as part of the San Francisco Port of Embarkation National Historic Landmark District and preserving the site's history. Actions undertaken by the NPS and the FMF are governed by Sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act. These sections stipulate the need to assess federal actions for potential effect on properties on or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places and to avoid, minimize, or develop mitigation measures in the event that a potential adverse effect may result to the historic resource. In order to ensure the preservation of the site's historic status, the NPS has developed protocols for the conservation and adaptive re-use of the structures and the grounds. Specifically, the NPS, the California Historic Preservation Office, and the

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation entered into a Section 106 Programmatic Agreement in 1992 that details the procedures that must be followed for modifications proposed at FMC.

Finally, from an administrative perspective, the NPS has a variety of agreements with different organizations and groups to operate, maintain, promote, and administer lands and activities within the GGNRA. The NPS manages and monitors its partners to maintain protection of GGNRA resources and permitting is a tool to ensure these organizations and groups are not allowed to operate entirely independently. Under this scenario, the NPS would not be aware of proposals and activities that might mistakenly be pursued to benefit the parklands and cultural resources and in reality conflict with state and/or federal regulations and laws. It is absolutely necessary for the NPS to remain in control and to provide for the necessary coordination with resource and regulatory agencies.

2. **Alma Robinson, President/Chairperson, Resident Organizations at Fort Mason Center.** Ms. Robinson, representing the resident organizations at FMC, spoke at the public meeting on September 9, 2003. Ms. Robinson stated that she supports the proposed lease because it would provide long-term growth and sustenance of FMC, and because it would require the FMF to be responsible for improvements at FMC. Ms. Robinson expressed concerns regarding the loss of existing free parking, which could, in turn, lead to additional vehicles roaming the streets of the adjacent Marina neighborhood in search of parking spaces. These comments are identical to the points that Ms. Robinson made at the earlier scoping meeting on March 18, 2003.

Response: Page 68 of the EA states that under the long-term lease, FMF would have the ability to impose parking fees in the FMC lot. The imposition of parking fees would have the potential adverse effect of some employees attempting to park in the nearby residential areas in order to avoid the fees, as suggested by the commenter. This effect would be more likely on the weekends, when residential parking restrictions are not in force, rather than on weekdays. FMC employees – who would be the most likely group to want to seek out free parking - are not a large portion of the population at FMC on weekend days (see page 69 of EA).

However, plans for imposition of parking fees within FMC have not been finalized. The EA and the Transportation Demand Management Plan (Appendix D of the EA) explain that there are many options for structuring a paid parking program and that there are options to accommodate short-term visitors and employees without substantially affecting parking supply in the neighboring Marina district. The FMF has stated that plans for imposition of parking fees would not be finalized without further discussions with FMC residents.

3. **James Lowe, Transit Planner, San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI).** Mr. Lowe submitted a comment letter dated September 16, 2003. The letter provides editorial corrections regarding transit terminology and MUNI transit line descriptions.

Response: The editorial corrections suggested by MUNI will be incorporated into the EA as stated in the Errata.

4. **Terry Roberts, Director, State Clearinghouse.** Mr. Roberts submitted a comment letter dated September 23, 2003. The letter acknowledges that the NPS met the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Enclosed with the State Clearinghouse letter was a comment letter from the Department of Transportation (Caltrans), also submitted directly to the NPS and described as Comment #5 below.

Response: The National Park Service acknowledges the comment. No further response is necessary.

5. **Timothy Sable, District Branch Chief, Department of Transportation (Caltrans).** Mr. Sable submitted a comment letter dated September 4, 2003. The letter states that Caltrans is “satisfied that the project will not have a significant impact to State highway facilities.”

Response: The National Park Service acknowledges the comment. No further response is necessary.

6. **Gloria Unti, Founder, Performing Arts Workshop (PAW).** Ms. Unti submitted a comment letter dated April 2, 2003. The letter states that PAW “fully supports Fort Mason Foundation’s proposal for a long-term lease with the National Park Service to continue its operation of the Fort Mason Center.”

Response: The National Park Service acknowledges the comment. No further response is necessary.